

From: [Crossland, Ronnie](#)
To: [Mason, Steve](#)
Subject: RE: MA issue
Date: Thursday, September 07, 2017 6:22:12 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Thanks and good point

From: Mason, Steve
Sent: Thursday, September 07, 2017 7:19 PM
To: Crossland, Ronnie
Subject: RE: MA issue

Might add that once the cost share may go back to 90%, the charges from the EOC would also be charged to the State at 10%

With Regards, Steve



From: Crossland, Ronnie
Sent: Thursday, September 07, 2017 6:15 PM
To: Mason, Steve <mason.steve@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: MA issue

Steve

How is this?

Ronnie

Bill,

I believe there are two options:

Option 1

FEMA Region 6 said EPA should consider having the HQ EOC request their hours be covered by the Federal Operation Support mission assignment they have for staffing the NRCC... this is a HQ mission assignment.

Option 2

If we determine that the HQ is directly supporting the activities in the field under a Mission Assignment, then according to FEMA, it would be allowable for the HQ EOC to charge against the current Region 6 Direct Federal Assistance Mission Assignment.

This second option could be audited later by FEMA with the potential that disagreed with our directly supporting the activities in the field determination.

Thanks,

Ronnie

From: Honker, William
Sent: Thursday, September 07, 2017 6:51 PM
To: Crossland, Ronnie <Crossland.Ronnie@epa.gov>
Subject: MA issue

Can you send me some draft language for a response as we discussed?

Bill

William K. Honker, P.E.
Director, Water Division
EPA Region 6
1445 Ross Ave., Suite 1200
Dallas, TX 75202
214-665-3187